

Application No. 10/780,998
Amendment dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 23, 2005

a line locking assembly for selectively securing a first portion of the fishing line to said body; and

a quick release assembly for releasably holding a second portion of the fishing line and for the quick release of the fishing line upon striking of the fishing hook by a fish, said quick release assembly including a movable element, said body having an aperture defined therein, said movable element being movably positioned substantially within said aperture of said body.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed February 23, 2003, in which Claims 1 through 9, 18 and 19 were allowed, Claims 10, 16 and 17 were rejected, and Claims 11 through 15 and 20 were objected to. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 10, 12 and 20 are amended herein. Claim 11 is are cancelled. No claims are added. Accordingly, Claims 1 through 10 and 12 through 20 remain pending.

Application No. 10/790,998
Amendment dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 23, 2005

All the changes are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

ALLOWED/ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

With respect to Page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner allowed Claims 1 through 9, 18 and 19. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's determination of allowability on these claims.

With respect to Page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Claims 11 through 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As set forth below, Applicants have amended Claim 10 to include the limitations of former dependent Claim 11, thus placing Claim 10 in condition for allowance.

AMENDED CLAIMS

Claims 10, 12, and 20 have been amended as follows:

Claim 10: The limitations of former Claim 11 (now cancelled) have been inserted into independent Claim 10.

Application No. 10/790,998
Amendment dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 23, 2005

Claim 12: The dependency of Claim 12 has been changed from "11" to –
10--.

Claim 20: The dependency of Claim 20 has been changed from "20" to –
19--.

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been introduced by
these changes.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Initially the Examiner objected to Claim 20 because "The diver of Claim
20" should be –The diver of Claim 19--.

Applicants have amended Claim 20 accordingly as set forth above.
Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to this claim is now overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. SECTION 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 10 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b)
as being anticipated by Even *et al.* Claim 10 is an independent claim and Claim
16 depends directly therefrom.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the
amendment to independent Claim 10 under which the limitations of former Claim
11 (now cancelled but previously held allowable) have been included into
amended independent Claim 10.

Application No. 10/790,998
Amendment dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 23, 2005

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Even *et al.* and further in view of Weber.

Claim 17 depends directly from independent Claim 10.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot in light of the amendment to independent Claim 10 under which the limitations of former Claim 11 (now cancelled but previously held allowable) have been included into amended independent Claim 10.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) are respectfully requested.

UNEXAMINED CLAIMS

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review unexamined Claims 21 and 22 which were submitted by way of Preliminary Amendment on October 11, 2004.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending Claims 1 through 10 and 12 through 20 as currently

Application No. 10/790,998
Amendment dated May 23, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated February 23, 2005

presented are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 248-433-7552 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas T. Moga
Registration No. 34,881
Attorney for Applicants

BUTZEL LONG
100 Bloomfield Hills Parkway
Suite 200
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
(248) 258-4496

TTM/hs

Dated: May 23, 2005